REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this amendment, the application included claims 1-38. A final office action mailed August 1, 2005 (the "initial office action") rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,073,242 to Hardy et al. ("Hardy") in view of the article entitled "Understanding And Deploying LDAP Directory Services" by Howes et al. ("Howes"). The final office action mailed August 1, 2005 (the "final office action") rejected claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. An advisory action mailed October 20, 2005 maintained the rejections of claim 1-37 but indicated that claim 38 is allowable over the cited references

This amendment amends claims 1, 14 and 24 and cancels claims 37 and 38 without prejudice or disclaimer. This amendment does not add any claims. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-36 stand pending for examination. This amendment is filed as the requisite submission for the request for continued examination filed herewith.

Claim Amendments

Claim has been amended to include the elements previously recited by claims 37 and 38. Claims 37 and 38 correspondingly have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 14 and 24 have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1.

§ 112 Rejection

The final office action rejected claim 38 under § 112, ¶ 1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This claim has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. However, because elements similar to those recited by claims 37 and 38 are now recited by claims 1, 14 and 24, the rejection of claim 38 is discussed herein.

Specifically, the final action asserted that lines 17-19 on page 47, which disclose that "The event catalog, which will be discussed in more detail below, is a list of events that trigger actions (e.g., cross application workflows) external to the workflow" does not support the

elements now recited by claims 1, 14 and 24. The applicants respectfully submit that this disclosure does support the elements of claim 1, 14 and 24, which recites "wherein at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow." The applicants further suggest that perhaps the Office misread the cited portion of the application, which the Office quotes as disclosing "User Manager. Or, they must be performed by the Group Manager, etc. Figure 20 is a flowchart describing the process of using a workflow. The process of Figure 20 is performed, for example, when creating a new user; a new ..." The language quoted by the office action actually can be found on lines 17-19 of page 46, not page 47 as attributed by the office action.

Moreover, the elements added to claims 1, 14 and 24 are supported by other portions of the application as well. Merely by way of example, page 48, lines 18-22 describes that "[t]he event catalog, which will be discussed in more detail below, is a list of events that trigger actions (e.g. cross application workflows) external to the workflow. In one embodiment, the event catalog is only checked if the template allowed for the use of external actions. For example, one of the actions allowed in a workflow step and defined in a template is "external_action." Further, lines 27-28 on page 50 describe how an entry in an event catalog may have a "path" value: "The "path" is the path for the external exc or dll to be launched." Based on this disclosure, as well as the disclosure originally cited as supporting claim 38, the applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 1, 14 and 24 are amply supported by the specification and request the withdrawal of the rejection under § 112.

It is noted that the final office action, on page 3, states that "claim 37 introduces new matter and is rejected for failing to comply with the written description requirement." Because the remainder of the § 112 rejection, however, deals only with claim 38, the applicants assume that the reference to claim 37 is merely a typographical error. Assuming, however, that the Office did intend to reject claim 37 under § 112, ¶ 1, the applicants note that other portions of the specification support the elements of old claim 37, which are now recited by claims 1, 14 and 24, as amended. Merely by way of example, as noted in a prior amendment, claim 37 is

supported by at least lines 4-6 on page 36, and 19-27 on page 49, of the application. Those

respective passages are reprinted below:

> A lot of the tasks that are performed in the Identity System
> are accomplished using workflows. A workflow is a predefined
> set of steps that perform a specific task, where information or tasks
> are passed between participants and programs according to a
> defined set of rules.

> * * *

> A workflow is performed by one of the three managers
> described above (User Manager, Group Manager, Organization
> Manager). There may be cases when one workflow in one of the
> applications (e.g. user manger) needs to trigger a workflow in
> another application (e.g. Group Manager). For example, when
> creating a new user with a workflow in the User Manager, it may
> be beneficial for that workflow to trigger another workflow in the
> Group Manager which subscribes the new user to groups. A cross
> application workflow is performed using the event catalog
> described above, a client program and (optionally) a configuration
> file for the client program, all of which will be described below.

Applicants submit that these passages, as well as other portions of the application,

amply support the amendments to claims 1, 14 and 27, which each recite, respectively "wherein:

said first workflow comprises a predefined set of steps that perform said task, said predefined set

of steps comprising a first step and a second step; said first step is performed by a first program;

said second step is performed by a second program; and information is passed between said first

program and said second program according to a defined set of rules." Hence, the amendments

to claims 1, 14, 24 are believed to be amply supported by the specification.

§ 103 Rejections

The final office action rejected claims 1-37 under § 103 as being unpatentable

over the combination of Hardy and Howes. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of

claims 1-37 under § 103(a), at least for the reasons stated in the applicants' response dated

October 3, 2005. In the interest of expeditious prosecution, however, the applicants have

amended independent claims 1, 14, and 24 to include the elements previously recited by claims

37 and 38.

Application No. 09/998,895
Amendment dated November 21, 2005
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure Examining Group 2176

PATENT

As indicated by the advisory action, the elements of claim 38 are patentably distinct over the cited references. It is believed, therefore, that claims 1, 14 and 24 are allowable over the cited references. Further, dependent claims 2-13, 15-23 and 25-26, each of which depend from one of claims 1, 14 or 24, are believed to be allowable as depending from allowable base claims and as being directed to specific novel substitutes.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1ᷓ-21-05

Chad E. King
Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CEK/jln
60640805 v1